

**Alexander Gloria**

**From:** Alison Elcox  
**Sent:** 13 November 2014 12:55  
**To:** Programme Officer  
**Subject:** Re: Matter 2

rather ad hoc. In addition to this the assessment of the smaller sites was flawed because a decision had been made before the public consultation to go with the new settlement option. It is therefore Dear Gloria, by some sites were included and some were rejected. One site for instance was rejected on the basis of no capacity in the local doctors surgery nor the school. A nearby site noted that there was capacity in the same doctors surgery and another local site showed available capacity in local primary schools. Also on some sites previous decisions by both an Inspector and a Secretary of State can back up these thoughts from analysis of submitted documents that are already in the library should you so wish, but understand that it is not appropriate to provide these at this late stage.

In answer to the Inspector's questions ....

a. Is the overarching development strategy, expressed as the preferred sequential approach for new development, soundly based and will it deliver sustainable development in accordance with the policies of the National Planning Policy Framework?

The overarching development strategy is soundly based, including the preferred sequential approach for new development but the purpose of my original consultation response was to bring to your attention that the sequential approach was identified but not subsequently followed. I can provide details of this if required. I know that the City refused to cooperate on Green Belt release but I have no evidence of that. The evidence is in the change in emphasis on the sequential approach, which was highlighted as being so 'confusing' for many of the speakers in the Council Chamber last Tuesday.

In view of this non adherence to the sequential approach the far less sustainable policy of building a new community and an extension to a village so far out of Cambridge means that this plan will not deliver sustainable development. The proposed area has not delivered sustainable development in accordance with policies in the NPPF for the last 17 years. The recent expansion of 950 homes has made no difference whatsoever to incoming investment, jobs, etc. The developers have been unable to market the employment sites. I can identify some of the sustainability policies in the NPPF and demonstrate that Cambourne does not comply now and there is no evidence that an extra 5,000 homes in the area will suddenly make it a more sustainable development if you wish.

So my view is that the current sequential approach is sound, but has not been followed and the resultant development proposals within the plan are unsustainable.

b. Is it clear what other strategic options were considered and why they were dismissed?

The strategic options were considered however the assessment was not done on an equal basis and rather ad hoc. In addition to this the assessment of the smaller sites was flawed because a decision had been made before the public consultation to go with the new settlement option. It is therefore not clear why some sites were included and some were rejected. One site for instance was rejected on the basis of no capacity in the local doctors surgery nor the school. A nearby site noted that there was capacity in the same doctors surgery and another local site showed available capacity in local primary schools. Also on some sites previous decisions by both an Inspector and a Secretary of State have been totally ignored, whereas in others this has been the prime reason for rejection. I can provide other instances should you so wish.

c. Are the Plans founded on a robust and credible evidence base?

The answer to this is both yes and no. There is a credible evidence base, but the assumption and assessment by the Council of some of the sites was flawed and did not follow the evidence due to the refusal of the City to cooperate on releasing Green Belt.

Regards

Cllr Alison Elcox

Cllr Alison Elcox  
District Councillor for Bourn Ward